

Remarks

This Response is considered fully responsive to the Office Action mailed March 30, 2007. Claims 1-21 were pending in the application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. In this Response, no claims have been amended, cancelled, or added. Claims 1-21 are now pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,560,748 to Li (“Li”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2000/0108090 by Ariel, et al. (“Ariel”). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites “partitioning the input data sequence into a plurality of sections.” Independent claim 10 recites that the buffer receives the input data sequence and “partitions the input data sequence into a plurality of sections.” Li, however, fails to teach or suggest any partitioning of the input data sequence. Further, Applicants note that the Office does not allege that Li teaches partitioning the input data sequence into a plurality of sections.

Indeed, Li explicitly teaches that the input data sequence is **not partitioned**. Referring to Figs. 6 and 7 of Li, the input or source data u is provided, in its entirety, to each of the interleavers 103-1, 103-2, 103-m, and the interleavers temporarily store the source data u. Each of the interleavers 103-1, 103-2, 103-m then “outputs the stored source data u in an order different from the input order. Thus, the source data u is randomized by the interleavers 103-1 through 103-m, respectively.” Li at col. 5, lines 31-34. As illustrated in Figs. 6 and 7, “[t]he interleavers 103-1 through 103-m outputs different data sequence u₁ through u_m, respectively. The data length of each of the data sequence u₁ through u_m is the same as the length of the source data u, that is, ‘N’ bits.” Li at col. 5, lines 36-40. Thus, Li fails to teach or suggest partitioning the input data sequence into a plurality of sections, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10.

Ariel is relied upon only to teach that different message lengths or different types of interleavers can be used to vary a particular message structure and that variable properties can be combined. Ariel also fails to teach or suggest partitioning of the input data sequence into a plurality of sections, as recited in independent claims 1 and 10.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Li and Ariel, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claims 1 and

10, and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-17. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 18 recites, *inter alia*, “determining a subset of interleavers, from a plurality of interleavers, to be used in generating the permuted data sequence.” Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is absent from the teachings of Li and Ariel. Further, Applicants note that the Office Action is silent regarding this feature of independent claim 18. This is not surprising, as Li teaches that the same input data is distributed to each of the interleavers, as discussed above.

As Ariel is relied upon only to teach that different message lengths or different types of interleavers can be used to vary a particular message structure and that variable properties can be combined, Ariel also fails to teach or suggest the determination of a subset of interleavers as recited in independent 18.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Li and Ariel, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all of the features of independent claim 18 and those claims depending directly or indirectly therefrom. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18-21. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application. Applicant has fully responded to each and every objection and rejection in the Office action dated March 30, 2007 and believes that claims 1-21 are in a condition for allowance. Applicant therefore requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

A two-month extension petition and accompanying fee are submitted herewith, via the Deposit Account No. 50-3199. The Applicant believes no other fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3199 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney. If the Examiner believes any issues could be resolved via a telephone

interview, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 29 August 2007

/Richard J. Holzer, Jr./
Richard J. Holzer, Jr. Reg. No. 42,688
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 64776

HENSLEY KIM & HOLZER, LLC
1660 Lincoln Street, Suite 3000
Denver, Colorado 80264
Tel: 720-377-0770
Fax: 720-377-0777